

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JERMEL ARCILICIA TAYLOR,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:24-cv-0773 SCR P

ORDER AND FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff, an Oregon state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. §1983. On screening the complaint, the court found this case may be untimely. (June 20, 2024 Order; ECF No. 8.) The court then described the statute of limitations for civil rights actions. Plaintiff was ordered to file, within thirty days, a statement regarding the application of the statute of limitations. Plaintiff was warned that if they failed to file that statement, the court would recommend this action be dismissed.

Thirty days have passed and plaintiff has not filed a statement regarding the application of the statute of limitations or otherwise responded to the court's order.¹

¹ On April 12, 2024, plaintiff filed a "motion for relief," the whole of which states, "COMES NOW, the Plaintiff, Jermel Taylor, and hereby petitions this court for relief of \$50,000, not \$1 Quadrillion like once stated ... Insha-Allah!" The amount of relief plaintiff seeks is not relevant to the timeliness of his action. Should the court dismiss plaintiff's action as recommended below, that motion will become moot in any event.

1 Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court IS HEREBY ORDERED to randomly assign a district
2 judge to this case; and

3 IT IS RECOMMENDED that this case be dismissed for plaintiff's failure to comply with
4 court orders. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. R. 110.

5 These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge
6 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one days
7 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections
8 with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings
9 and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified
10 time may result in waiver of the right to appeal the district court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951
11 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

12 Dated: August 19, 2024

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



SEAN C. RIORDAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE